



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE VERSIFICATION OF LATIN METRICAL INSCRIPTIONS EXCEPT SATURNIANS AND DACTYLICS.

BY ARTHUR WINFRED HODGMAN.

IT is my purpose to present briefly some of the more important results of an investigation into the structure of the Latin metrical inscriptions, with the exception of the Saturnians and the dactyls. These are now available in Franz Bücheler's *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Leipzig, 1895-1897. Not all that he gives can be safely used: much must be thrown out that has simply "color poeticus"; and hypermetric verses it is safer to reject, unless they have been made hypermetric by unwieldy proper names or ages—for most of our material is sepulchral. Still, I have been careful in my selection not to beg the question by admitting only those verses that follow strictly the rules of literary verse. My final selection included 1066 verses or reasonably certain fragments of verses. It is hardly necessary to remark that, as I have admitted fragments of verses, my figures will not agree with any scheme for a given number of complete verses.

The Latin epigraphic verses show very clearly the use of "archetypes," as Bücheler calls them; on these R. Cagnat has a most interesting article in the *Révue de Philologie*, XIII, 1889, p. 51. Archetypes must have been in use early, to judge by the similarity of the epitaph of A. Atilius Calatinus (cos. 258, 254 B.C.) given by Cicero (*Cato Maior* 61), and that of L. Cornelius Scipio (cos. 259 B.C.), *CIL*. I, 32. Verses thus recurring I have used but once.

The dating of the metrical inscriptions is not an easy matter; as a whole they have been characterized as "timeless." I have established roughly three classes: I, down to 44 B.C.; II, from 44 B.C. to Trajan; III, from Trajan on. A few imperial inscriptions resisted even such an assignment, and these I treated in class IV. The

character of the inscriptions of the empire is tolerably uniform, and I believe no important points have been obscured by this classification. The older senarii are, on the whole, better than the younger, in versification as well as in poetic value; but verses strict in such points as the even arses of the senarius gained proportionately on the free sort as time went on. The rarer metres came in only after the establishment of the empire.

Metres are intermingled in single inscriptions in various ways. *CLE*. 1554 consists of two iambic dimeters acatalectic, an Ionic dimeter a minore, two iambic dimeters acatalectic, two iambic senarii, and two unmetrical lines. 1526 has seven dactylic hexameters, two iambic senarii, four iambic dimeters acatalectic and three trochaic septenarii. 1522 shows eight iambic dimeters acatalectic, curiously combined with eight first Pherecratics acatalectic. These will serve as examples.

Of our 1066 verses, 695 are iambic senarii, and 58 are trochaic septenarii. It is but natural to compare these with verses in the same metres in Plautus and Terence. 106 senarii antedate 44 B.C., but it is doubtful if any are contemporary with Plautus or Terence. Still the evidence of our inscriptions is not to be disregarded; positive confirming evidence is certainly to be accepted, and evidence of any other kind held in reserve. The whole number of verses is relatively small — hardly more senarii than in an average comedy — and we must not expect too much in the way of results. Then, too, we must remember that the subject matter of the epitaphs has undoubtedly had its effect on the wording and structure of the verse; for instance, *meus* and *suus* and their cases are in constant recurrence and form very convenient ends of verses.

In most cases, it has seemed advisable to treat the verses as they actually stand on the stones. Often it is easy to see what the composer *should* have written, or the graver cut; but I am not so inclined to transpose or to substitute, *metri gratia*, as Bücheler seems to be. Various suggestions may be found in his notes to the inscriptions, and other emendations can often be thought of; but for the sake of brevity I have usually omitted them.

SENARI.

Structure of the Even Feet.

SECOND FOOT.							FOURTH FOOT.				
CLASS.	IAMBUS.	SPONDEE.	TRIACH.	DACTYL.	ANAPAEST.	PROCELEUS- MATIC.	IAMBUS.	SPONDEE.	TRIACH.	DACTYL.	ANAPAEST.
I	38	35	4	15			38	52	2	10	2
II	106	54	9	24	11	2	84	60	6	19	6
III	161	43	7	12	3		135	59	4	13	1
IV	53	42	5	20	5	1	58	50	8	17	6
	358	174	25	71	19	3	315	221	20	59	15

We shall understand the even feet more clearly if we examine each inscription by itself, to see whether or not the composer was trying to adhere to Greek usage in the formation of the even arses. We must throw out of the count those inscriptions that are so short as to shed no real light upon the matter. In this way we get a corrective upon the varying length of the inscriptions, and we reach these results :

CLASS.	STRICT INSCRIPTIONS.	FREE INSCRIPTIONS.	PERCENTAGE OF STRICT.	PERCENTAGE OF FREE.
I	3	15	16.67	83.33
II	19	37	33.93	66.07
III	12	18	40.00	60.00
IV	15	31		
	49	101	32.67	67.33

From this we see that the free sort of verse continued to be written throughout the whole period covered by our inscriptions, and is oftener represented than the strict. Noteworthy,

however, is the increasing tendency to write verses with the even arses short.

Meyer's Law, in free verse, is

CLASS.	OBSERVED.	BROKEN.
I	12	2
II	25	9
III	12	5
IV	25	7
	74	23

Less than half the cases of neglect occur in inscriptions that can be called really good. According to Draheim (*Hermes* XV, 1880, p. 243) this law was obscured soon after Terence's time and was unknown to Varro, Horace (of course, for his verse is strict!), Quintilian, or Terentianus Maurus. I have not seen mentioned in this connection the words in Cicero, *Orator* 222

Missos faciānt patronos, ipsi prodeant

which Cicero gives as a senarius.

Our cases of neglect of Meyer's Law (if we can call them "neglect") consist of 11 spondees, 4 molossi, 2 anapaests, 4 polysyllables with spondaic ending, and 2 with anapaestic ending. The word *éueniānt*, in a good inscription (64.4) suggests the form *euenant*, but ³finds ⁴parallels in Plautus, *Persa* 454, 629. In 82.9 (fragmentary, good) *céciderānt* may have had a short penult. The other cases ³⁴show nothing noteworthy.

Resolutions.

Resolutions occur frequently, and in just the same relation to the beginnings and ends of words as in Plautus and Terence. The following tables show their distribution:

e) Very doubtful is 95.3 spart³eam ūt sibi

f) Tribrachs with accented penult (cf. Klotz, *l.l.* 273):

67.3 Itāquē¹ 211.3 nimīā²

92.2 Stephānē¹

g) Resolved arses divided by caesura :

1534. B, 1. depressérē⁴ uēnēfīcae⁵. Bücheler is of the opinion that this was pronounced *uenēfīcae*, on the analogy of *benēfīcus*.

195.1 ffāt hōnóratus^{3 4}

h) Resolved arses forming the end of dactylic words :

1186.16 nūmīnīs inf—. Doubtless should be *nūmini* with elision.

64.1 Sospītā pīa^{4 5}

Seven places similar to these may be treated by synizesis ; e.g.

24.2 úrbjūm cōn—, 172.6 débūt fīlius^{4 5}

112.9 Iúliā Prīma^{1 2}

On the whole, these exceptional accentuations follow very closely the rules that have been established for them in comedy. The few cases that do not, either are caused by recalcitrant proper names, or else occur in inscriptions that are otherwise metrically poor.

Of the twelve anapaests in the third foot, 109.3 and 160.2 offend more than the rest ; for in these the two unaccented shorts precede the main caesura. All but three occur in poor inscriptions.

We may note that the proceleusmatics gravitate toward the early part of the senarius, and that they all have a caesura after the second short.

Structure of the Fifth Foot.

CLASS.	SPONDEE.	IAMBUS.	DACTYL.	TRIBRACH.	ANAPAEST.	PROCELEUS- MATIC.
I	85	6	2		10	I
II	126	23	1	I	19	
III	157	31	7	I	10	
IV	108	13	3		11	
615	476	73	13	2	50	I

The tribrachs are 73.2 Iuentiā⁵ Hilara and 29.6 conuenitē⁵ pīlcrepi. The proceleusmatic, 64.1 Sospitā⁵ piā, may find a partial fifth foot parallel in Terence, *Adelphi* 29.

An iambus in the fifth foot is admitted by recent scholars only under fixed rules; see Luchs, in *Studemund's Studien*, I, pp. 5, 13, 18; Klotz, *l.l.* 237, 244, 245. Of our 73 iambs, 60 conform to these rules. There remain

111.33	(good inscription)	placére nón queám
198.2	(" ")	tras ⁴ (feris) h ⁵ (únc) l(ocúm)
198.1	(" ")	nóstr ⁴ (a) quísquis ⁵ és

These are practically cretic clausulae, and so unobjectionable.

62.1	(good inscription)	fuít paréns ⁵
216.6	(rather poor)	statím periít ⁵

On such iambic words in the fifth foot see Luchs, pp. 8, 49.

108.11	(fair inscription)	pérlegás libéns ⁵
134.7	(good ")	pérlegít meúm ⁵
24.3	(fair ")	cóntigít deós ⁵
148.1	(good ")	fáctuí meó ⁵

This cadence is especially offensive to Luchs (see pp. 8, 49). Practically the same are

44.5	(poor inscription)	dúlcis ést amór ⁵
1585.1	(" ")	quísquis ⁵ és ualé ⁵

There remain

69.4	(good inscription)	prósecútus ést ⁵
111.39	(" ")	supérstitém mihí ⁵

Of course no new rule can be deduced from these few miscellaneous instances; we should, however, remember that Luchs had to cut

and emend to make his rules. Our exceptions occur at the rate of 2.11 to a hundred verses; 8 are from good inscriptions.

The Main Caesura.

	CLASS I.	II.	III.	IV.	664.
Semiquinaria	70	145	182	112	509
Semiseptenaria	16	23	19	13	71
Second foot diaeresis	11	33	9	10	63
Third foot diaeresis by elision	5		1		6
Real third foot diaeresis	1	5	1	8	15

In six verses (56.3, 59.18, 68.13, 69.1, 70.2, 91.6) we have elision at the main caesura between the third foot and the fourth; that is, we have quasi-caesura, which in Greek is recognized as equivalent to a caesura in the fourth foot. Five of our six are early, and five are in distinctly good inscriptions. None of the 15 forbidden caesuras (2.25 per cent of the whole) are from the better class of stones.

Length of Vowels.

a) Undoubted instances of *archaic long vowels* are few:

- 59.16 (good) tolīt animó (⁴tolīt ⁵ānimó ⁴would not be legitimate)
- 121.1 (good) libēt intús (⁴libēt ⁵intús)
- 81.2 (fair) pudōr et (cf. Lucilius, XXX 70 M.) (⁴pudōr ⁵et)

Very doubtful are

- 216.6 (poor) Rosā¹ simul floriuit (nom. s.)
- 128.2 (poor) opta 'tibi terrā leue' (⁵opta 'tibi terrā leue')
- 108.5 (fair) ornatā⁵ suis ("ornatrix debuit scribi aut ornatu" F.B.)
103. B. 4. (fragmentary, poor) aeternā⁵ fidés
- 190.2 (very poor) uíta dúm paruā⁵ manét

- 132.2 (otherwise good) Sit suáuitér et tibi bené sit qui legís
 Bücheler's neat *tibique* removes both difficulties.
- 174.2 (poor) fecít (transposition helps all)
- 165.1 (fair) fūit (should be *fūērat*, as 164.1, 167.1 show)
- 62.1 (fragmentary, good) fuít paréns (the fifth foot offends unless
 spondaic)

b) *False quantities.* We can do little more than list the instances ; for it is usually impossible to decide whether it was the composer or the stone-cutter who was at fault.

i) Short vowels used as longs :

- 102.4 ālumnús 100.2 pālaestraé
- 50.1 Mentūla
- 58.1 fliūs illúm (so Wagner on Ter. *Haut.* 217 !)
- 112.8 Sororiq. coniugís ornauit memoria
- 89.7 libértatís ac- (*libertátis* \perp ac- is less harsh)
- 216.6 Rosā, nom. s. and other similar instances already listed.
103. C. 6 ācerbos
- 44.2 Magí properares (of course *magi*[s], and only apparently false ;
 initial mute and liquid do not lengthen)
- 133.1 Quisque praeteriens (*quisque* for *quisquis* also in *CIL.* VIII,
 4120)
- 187.2 Quod cōmedi et ebibi tantum meu est. Bücheler proposes
 (*Nam*) *quod comedi*, and thus avoids three difficulties. Compare, however, 244.1, an exactly similar acephalous septenarius.
- 112.4 frūitus 190.1 frūamur
- 190.8 commōdauit. In 213.7 *accōmodá* ends the verse ; the six other
 verses of 213 are choliamb, — is v. 7 a choliamb or a senarius ?

A syllable long by position is shortened by a preceding short in

58.3	Quoād uíxi (quōd ?)	64.3	bene ēxístumant
68.12	Nihīl tímeo	1585.3	Alēxánder
75.2	nīhīl fuit	24.1	Immínēt Leóni
130.2	Id illí	1544.8	Ambúla ēt te
50.3	tíbi ūt re-	95.3	spartéam ūt sibí

One monosyllable is shortened, 74.1 et hōc ád (hoc = huc)

Vowels long by nature are irregularly shortened in four polysyllables:

68.11	ínīqua (caused by tinkering an archetype)
112.8	Sorōríq. (in a very poor inscription)
23.1	Hercúlēs and 100.2 Pocúlī have already been noticed.

Iambic shortening was resorted to less and less as time went on. It was used in later times not as a license consciously understood, but rather in a limited number of common words which had been permanently affected by the early tendency, such as *ego*, *tibi*, *modo*. The natural iambi that appear as pyrrhics are

mihi	8	ego	5	haue	4
tibi	6	modo	1	uale	1
sibi	2	fero	1	fui	1
ubei and ubi	3	puto	1	leges	1
ibi	1	rogo	2		7
	20		10	Total	37

The *mihi-ibi* class of words are used

As pyrrhics	20 times
In the sixth foot	24
As iambi	8

that is, they are used as iambi only on a metrical pinch.

d) Position before Mute and Liquid (and fr).

SHORT SYLLABLES BEFORE.	REMAIN SHORT.	ARE INDE-TERMINATE.	ARE LENGTHENED.	FINAL MUTE INITIAL LIQUID.	FINAL VOWEL INITIAL MUTE.
pl	3	2			
tl				I	
cl	2				
bl					I
dl				I	
pr	I	4			5
tr	9	8	4	3	2
cr	10	2	I		I
br		I			
dr				I	
gr		I	I		2 (I short I indet.)
fr	2	I	I		I
	27	19	7	6 (all lengthened)	12 (I short II indet.)

Of the seven instances of length, only one is early.

- 59.6 pát-rono (Between Sulla and Caesar)
 ₃
- 40.1 pát-re (Pompei)
 ₄
103. A. 1 pát-ri (Probably 1st century)
 ₄
- 1602.1 pát-ris (327 A.D.)
 ₃
- 29.4 Ag-rippae (As late as 126 A.D. So in Verg. *Aen.* 8. 682,
 ₄ Hor. *Od.* 1. 6. 5)
- 19.1 sác-ra (“*Saeculi II exeuntis*”)
 ₂
1527. B. 3 réf-reno (Between 166 and 180 A.D.).
 ₄

e) Miscellaneous, quantity.

- 72.1 ullíus. The inscription is fragmentary, but the *i* seems cer-
 ₃ tainly long.

- 130.2 Id illi.¹ Bücheler remarks "*etiam tum* [circa annum 50 p. C. n.] *pronuntiatum est illi correpta syllaba priore.*" This does not at all follow from this one instance; the distich in 130 is undoubtedly derived from an archetype of an earlier time — cf. the twin couplet 129, and Muratori 1635.14.

There is no instance in our inscriptions of *inde unde* or *nēmpē*. 131.2 has *omnia* probably, rather than *ōmnia*. 1392.5 gives as the end of a pentameter

iam lapis ste minas (Mart. 6. 76.4).

- 157.2 sērō (in iambi Graecanici)

Hiatus.

a) Non-elision of monosyllables:

- 57.5 (fragmentary but good) cū āmeiceis⁴
 63.5 (excellent) tām īniquom⁴
 77.2 (cento of Augustan age) iām āliquid³
 29.11 (as late as 126 A.D.; cannot be referred to an archetype)
 dē āpotheca³

Very doubtful is 103. C. 4 Sic me amasti. It seems likely that *Sic mē āmausti*, or *Sic nōs amāsti* stood in the original.

We also find this non-elision twice in trochaic septenarii (233.3, 241.1).

b) Real hiatus:

- 82.7 (good inscription metrically)
 Rumóre sáncto * Ílyrici iaceo ín soló^{2 3}
 83.2 (fair)
 Iuenís teténdi * út haberém quod úterér^{2 3}
 83.4 (fair)
 Bene ufue, própera, * hóc est uéniundúm tibi^{2 3}

84.2 (good)

Memórium habéto * ésse hanc mórtalém domúm.
² ³

85.2 (poor)

Gratús parénti * átque amícis ómnibús
² ³

92.11 (fair)

Haue púpa blánda, * ánima m[
² ³

Bücheler's restoration seems very likely, and necessitates hiatus.

24.7 (fair)

Libyaé coléndum. * índe cúnci dídicimús.
² ³

29.8 (excellent)

Folióque múlto * ádq̄ue unguénto márcidó
² ³

29.10 (excellent)

Nigrúm Falérnum * aút Setínium aut Caécubúm.
² ³

97.10 (good; written by translator of Menander)

Vos ín sepúlchro * [h]óc eló[gium inc]ídite
² ³

There is not room on the stone for Haupt's suggestion, *hoc elogium oro incidite*.

101.2 (fair)

Paréntes suási, * ártefíc(ium) díscerém
² ³

102.3 (poor)

Ut hóc uenírem * ánnis plénus XI (*i.e. úndecim*)
² ³ ⁵ ⁶

108.9 (fair)

Repléta quártum * útero ménse octáuo obít
² ³

112.2 (poor)

In práma aetáte * éx Germána cóniugá
² ³

128.2 (fair)

Et léges hunc títulum, * ópta 'tíbi terrá leué'
² ³

We might scan *títulum optá tibi*, but *tibi* is usually pyrrhic.
² ³ ⁴

141.6 (poor)

Maríto exhíbui * ín diém uitaé meaé
² ³

197.3 (good)

Rogo né sepúlcri * úmbras uíolare aúdeás
² ³

216.3 (poor)

Breuí reuérti, * únde nóbis éditá
2 3

1557.4 (poor)

Celebrí fauóre * ártem éxponéns suám
2 3

1585.1 (poor)

Prímítíua hāue : * ét tu quísquis és ualé
3

1792.2 (good)

Primílla mátri * óp[se]quéns pl[aci]ta ómnibús
2 3

81.3 (fair; from a Graecanic archetype, disturbed by the adapter.

Hiatus did not exist in the original; see 145.1)

Nolí dólere, amíca, * éuentúm meúm
3 4

1788.3 (poor)

Amándió * ob sórte e[t] fórtuna ímprobá
2 3

190.6 (poor)

Et nós antíquorúm * emitémur témporá
3 4

86.1 (good)

Iulía * Erótis fémina óptima híc sitást
1 2

103. C. 4 (poor)

Sic mé * amásti ut nátos dērelínquerés
1 2

Various suggestions are possible, e.g. *Sic mē̃ amásti* * *ut nátos*, or
perhaps best of all, *Sic mē̃ āmauísti ut nátos*
1 2 3

1547.1 (poor)

Quem fátum * éripuít primá lanúginé
1 2

76.5 (good)

Valéte * ét bene fácite uó[
1 2

Probably caused by change from singular to plural; cf. 76.1, 76.2,
77.6.

1585.1 (poor)

Prímítíua * hāue ét tu quísquis és ualé
1 2

68.5 (poor)

commú]ni heic ánimo dúo * ut éssemús sití
3 4

1547.2 (poor)

Et míhi dolórem mátri * ímposuít graué³m⁴

73.3 (poor)

Monumé(n)tum fécit mátri * ét sibi ét uiró³⁴

102.4 (poor)

Nam omnia fecérunt quórum * álmúnús fuí³⁴

1557.4 (poor)

Celebrí fauóre ártem * éxponéns suám³⁴

108.10 (fair)

Attónitus cápita núnc uersórum * ínspicé⁴⁵

127.2 (fair)

Mihi qui hóc locó monumént(um) féci * ét meís⁴⁵

73.2 (poor)

Verná Rufria híc sum síta. Iuéntiá * Hilará⁵

To these 37 instances I might add 5 more (29.6, 89.3 [bis], 143.3, 187.2), were they not rather doubtful, or capable of other scansion.

9 cases of hiatus
come from good
inscriptions

{ 7 at semiquinaria caesura,
1 due to proper name,
1 due to change of number.

28 cases of
hiatus come
from fair
and from poor
inscriptions

{ 17 { 14 at semiquinaria,
at { 1 at semiseptenaria,
main { 1 at second foot diaeresis,
caesura, { 1 at third foot diaeresis,
11 at other parts of the verse.

Of all these 37 cases of hiatus, 24 are at the main caesura, and of these 24, 7 are from excellent inscriptions. We recall the 240 instances, listed by Spengel in his *T. Maccius Plautus*, 1865, pp. 189–199, of hiatus at the penthemimeral caesura, and we begin to wonder if those 240 or our 24 can be due to chance, or whether hiatus at a pause or main caesura was not permitted in the senarius. If it was legitimate, its absence from most of the comic verses would mean nothing; but its presence in a respectable number would be significant. Some of our verses, though occurring with others that are faulty, have themselves no metrical flaw save the

supposed one of hiatus. One may, like Bücheler, propose to transpose words, or to substitute other words for those on the stones; but it seems very curious that, if these cases of hiatus were due to transpositions or to substitutions, so large a part of them, 24 out of 37, should fall just at the metrical pause, 21 of them at the pen-themimeral caesura. Their chronological distribution may be seen from this table:

	HIATUS AT MAIN PAUSE.	ELSEWHERE.	TOTAL.	VV. IN CLASS.	PERCENTAGE.
I		3	3	106	2.83
II	6	4	10	214	4.67
III	8	3	11	229	4.80
IV	10	3	13	146	8.90
	24	13	37	695	5.32

We see that hiatus occurs more frequently in the later classes than in class I, but that hiatus at the main caesura predominates. If we compare our cases of hiatus with those in Plautus, we must of course bear in mind the difference in time, but we should not neglect the evidence of the stones. It is in agreement with the notions that prevailed at the time when the arguments to Plautus's plays were written; and it is so strong as at least to make it worth while for some one again to look into Spengel's long list.

The vowels standing before hiatus are: —*ă* 5, —*ĕ* 2, —*ō* 1, —*em* 2, —*um* 8 (total shorts 18); —*ā* 1, —*ē* 3, —*ī* 10, —*ō* 5 (total longs 19).

Conspectus of Cases of Hiatus.

AT MAIN PAUSE OF VERSE.	IN GOOD,	FAIR,	OR POOR INSCRIPTIONS.
$\frac{\text{—}}{2} \cup \frac{*}{3} \frac{\text{—}}{3}$ $\frac{\text{—}}{3} \cup \frac{*}{4} \frac{\text{—}}{4}$ $\frac{\text{—}}{2} \frac{*}{3} \cup \frac{\text{—}}{3}$ $\frac{\text{—}}{3} \frac{*}{4} \cup \frac{\text{—}}{4}$	7	7 I	7 I I

NOT AT MAIN PAUSE.	IN GOOD,	FAIR,	OR POOR INSCRIPTIONS.
$\begin{array}{c} \text{—} * \text{—} \text{—} \\ \text{I} \quad \quad 2 \\ \text{—} \text{—} * \text{—} \text{—} \\ \text{I} \quad \quad 2 \\ \text{—} * \text{—} \text{—} \text{—} \\ 3 \quad \quad 4 \\ \text{—} \text{—} * \text{—} \text{—} \\ 3 \quad \quad 4 \\ \text{—} \text{—} * \text{—} \text{—} \\ 4 \quad \quad 5 \\ \text{—} \text{—} * \text{—} \text{—} \\ 5 \end{array}$	I I	 2	I 2 I 4 I
37	9	10	18

Elision, especially of Long Vowels and Diphthongs.

	<i>ā</i>	<i>ē</i>	<i>ī</i>	<i>ei</i>	<i>ō</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>ae</i>	TOTAL.	VV. IN CLASS.	INSTANCES TO 100 VV.
I	4	8	8	7	8	I	2	38	106	35.84
II		8	20		15		7	50	214	23.36
III	3		2		10		2	17	229	7.42
IV	2	4	12		9			27	146	18.49
	9	20	42	7	42	I	11	132	695	18.99

This decrease is remarkable, though in agreement with the fact that stricter verse was written more and more as time went on.

-um est, -a est, etc. cut on the stones 19 times

-umst, -ast, etc. 10

Vowel elided at the main caesura 43

Such spellings as *Magi* (44.2), *hanc . . . opera* (112.5) *tantum meum est* (187.2) call for no comment. Quite by itself stands *hominesse*, in a trochaic septenarius (241) :

Cógitató té hōminesse et scētō : móriendúst.ualé.

Synizesis.

1) Forms of *meus*, *tuus*, *suus*, 10 instances. There is no trace in our inscriptions of the forms *sam*, *sos*, *sas*. These possessives are used

As monosyllables 10 times

In sixth foot 57

As iambi, by nature or position 16

- 2) Forms of *is* and *idem*, 8 instances. Noteworthy are
- 168.2 Genitōres ²eius acérba mórs facere ímpulſt
- 91.10 ¹Eius óssa núnc hic síta sunt pósito a cén[t]urís
- with which we may compare
- 53.2 Dum osténdit quód mandáuit, ⁴quoíus umbrám te[g]t
- 69.3 Quoíus fátum acérbum pópulus índigné tulſt
- 63.3 Sepúlta heic síta sum, uérna ⁴quoíus aetátulá

These render improbable the theory that genitive forms *ei* and *quoi* (cf. Priscian, *G. L.* II 228 κ.) may be put into the text of Plautus where the scansion demands a monosyllabic *eius* or *quoius*.

- 3) Forms of *deus*, 2 instances.
- 4) *Níl* is cut twice. *Nihil* with synizesis (or iambic shortening?) occurs three times. *Nihil* fills the sixth foot twice, but does not fill any other foot.
- 5) Consonantization of *i* and *u* occurs in these words: *Donatíanus*, *Euelphius*, *Iulía*, *Lucilíanum*, *Pacilía*, *Veldumñianus*. *Biarci* (1602.1) is probably an error for *Marci*. On *Diarrytos* (107.4) see Pliny *N. H.* 5. 23; *Zaritus* and a variety of other spellings occur, see *CIL.* VIII, preface to 1206–1215. Further, in *eclesiá*, *iniuriám*, *peculío*, *urbium*, *omnia*. 143.4 has *aliud*; should this be *alid*? (Ritschl, *Op.* IV, 452.) In 207.1 and 216.6 *periit* fills the sixth foot; Bücheler notes “*periit*, iambus; eas syllabas inde ab Seneca solitas esse contrahi constat.” Also in *nesci[o]* (54.3) and *debut* (172.6) the only instance of *u* in our senarii.
- 6) Miscellaneous, pronunciation. The words *Hercules*, *Poculi*, *Ambula* have already been noticed.

The “sightly dame” Claudia

- 52.5 Gnatos duos creauit, horunc alterum
In terra linquit, *alium* sub terra locat.

“uitauit scriptor ‘*altrum*.’ par huic exemplum haud facile inueneris apud antiquos.” F. B. A late parallel occurs in Arg. Plaut. *Capt.* v. 2. Cf. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 449.

119.2 Cum *diu* ¹*āmbulā*²*re*is

88.1 *u*³*fua* *mihi* ⁴*ā*⁵*t*⁶*ernam domum*

mi is cut in 42.2 and in 58.4.

90.3 *adquies*⁵*cerent*

197.2 *assint qui*²*ēti*

Bücheler compares *quiesco* in 477.3 (hexameter), and the inscriptional forms frequent after the Antonines, *Quetus*, *Quita*, *requescere*, *inquietare*.

91.5 Magister ludi litterari Philocalus

91.10 *p*⁴*ō*⁵*sita a cē*⁶*n*⁷*[t]ur*⁸*is* (we should expect *centuriis*)

End of Senarius.

CLASS.	I.	II.	III.	IV.	TOTAL.
Monosyllable	1	4	3	5	13
Dissyllable	55	94	80	66	295
Cretic or dactyl	34	48	89	51	222
Iuentia Hilara		1			1
Words measured like <i>pārentibus</i>	1	8	9	2	20
<i>incōmmōda</i>	7	10	17	7	41
<i>uītūpēres</i>	2	2	7	1	12
<i>uīgīlāntia</i>		3		2	5
<i>sōllicitūdīne</i>	1		2		3
<i>iūcūndissīmo</i>		1	2		3
<i>dērēlinquēres</i>		3		1	4
	101	174	209	135	619

The monosyllables are: *sum* (1), *es* (2), *est* (9), enclitics, and *ante me*, — all 13 practically cretic endings.

The dissyllabic endings consist of

meus, tuus, suus and their cases 57 } 27.45 per cent of the
mihi - ibi set of words 24 } dissyllabic endings.
 Other words 214

Forms in Terence reserved for End of a Verse.

Our inscriptions agree with the usage of Terence, so far as our very scanty evidence goes.

- 1) Fuller forms in *-auer-*, *-ouer-*, etc. 1 at end of verse.

Contracted forms in *-arunt*, *-arant*, etc. 5 in interior of verse.

- 2) ornáriér, státuérúnt.

- 3) On *nihil* and *nil*, see above.

- 4) We have seen that the shorter form *pocli* seems likely for the fuller form that is cut. Once we get *uínculúm*.

Coincidence.

COMPLETE VV.		IN 1ST FT.	IN 2D.	IN 3D.	IN 4TH.	IN 5TH.
I	86	56	77	77	52	42
II	154	93	142	138	88	86
III	207	129	199	179	122	141
IV	115	74	99	99	63	66
	562	352	517	493	325	335

These figures, however, are deceptive. We often find verses like 52.2

Heic ést sepúlcrum hau púlcrum púlcrat fémínaé

and again verses often end like 53.5

nésciús ne essés. ualé

with no coincidence at the close. The following table shows the number of verses with coincidence in one, two, three or more feet :

	COMPLETE VV.	IN ONE ONLY.	IN TWO.	IN THREE.	IN FOUR.	IN ALL FIVE.
I	86	1	14	27	26	18
II	154	4	22	39	58	30
III	207	4	19	64	64	56
IV	115	1	29	25	33	27
	562	10	84	155	181	131

A detailed examination of the effect of the laws governing the structure of our senarii leads me to the opinion that it was the nature of the verse itself, rather than any conscious effort on the part of the composers, that caused coincidence. It might be questioned whether "the nature of the verse" were not simply a reflex of the desire for certain effects in the way of coincidence; but among other things the close rivalry of cretic and dissyllabic clausulae counts against such a belief, for the effect of the two endings is exactly opposite, as far as coincidence in the fifth foot is concerned. What von Christ says of the comic poets, in his *Metrik* ² § 392, does not apply to ours. Against him are the figures of Oscar Brugman (Bonn, 1874) as well as ours, — and our verses are far more numerous than those readily available when Brugman wrote. Our verses differ greatly among themselves in the matter of coincidence; but, when treated together, the figures show an apparent and misleading uniformity.

CHOLIAMBI.

We have 21 verses, in 8 inscriptions, all later than the republic. Group A consists of 4 monostichs closely connected with senarii; group B, of 4 inscriptions of 6, 3, 4, and 4 verses. The difference in the two groups may be seen from these tables:

A.	1ST.	2D.	3D.	4TH.	5TH.
Spondee	3	3	1	3	1
Iambus	1		1		2
Anapaest		1			
Dactyl			2	1	1

B.	1ST.	2D.	3D.	4TH.	5TH.
Spondee	8	* 1	13		
Iambus	6	14	3	17	17
Anapaest	3				
Dactyl			1		
Tribrach		2			

* Due to proper name.

As the freely constructed verses in A are closely connected with senarii, they may have arisen from senarii by substitutions. Group B is rather strict in formation.

Results from 21 verses are scanty. The 4 resolved arses and the 7 resolved theses are normal. The fifth foot is now free to be an iambus and is iambic 19 times; this is to avoid $-\frac{\text{—}}{5} - \frac{\text{—}}{6}$, for the same reason that $\cup \frac{\text{—}}{5} \cup \frac{\text{—}}{6}$ is usually avoided in the senarius. In A the main caesura comes after the fourth arsis; in B, 16 times after the third arsis, once after the fourth. Elision is rare — 4 longs, 2 shorts.

213.7 is not a choliambus, in spite of 190.8; v. 7 differs in the fifth foot, as well as in the sixth, from vv. 1–6. We have the same mixture in 216.

215.3 Sic *nūnquam dōleas* átque trīste sūspīres apparently has a dactyl in the second place; but the 7 other even arses are short. Bücheler quotes Probi Appendix, G. L. IV, p. 199, 15, κ., and *CLE*. 31.2 *nusqua*.

Hiatus occurs twice in 216 :

216.4 *Natūom* ¹ * *ésset* ² *ét paréntibús* *luctu*

5 *Semíssem* ¹ * *ánni* ² *ufxit ét diés octo*

We might think of *esset natūom* ¹ * and *anní semíssem*. ¹ ² 216.3, a senarius, has hiatus at the penthemimeral caesura.

End of Choliambi.

	A.	B.
Spondaic word	1	14
Molossic “	1	2
Ionic a minore	1	.
Monosyllable	sunt	est

Coincidence in 21 Complete Choliambi.

		1ST.	2D.	3D.	4TH.	5TH.
A	4	3	3	4	2	1
B	17	10	17	17	13	2

Ordinarily the nature of the choliamb leaves coincidence to the choice of the poet only in the first and in the fourth foot.

IAMBIC DIMETERS ACATALECTIC.

We find 14 inscriptions, with 60 verses; there is a late one in 223.1, and possibly a few lurk at the end of 1257 (fragmentary). Only 5 are datable, and all are pretty uniform in character. In the second arsis, 7 inscriptions (35 vv.) admit only a short syllable. Their structure:

	1ST.	2D.	3D.
Iambus	12	41	9
Tribrach		5	1
Spondee	36	7	46
Dactyl	3	6	1
Anapaest	8		3
	59	59	60

On vowel length we note only 218.3, *cursándō* and 219.16, *némō*. Once each *ā* and *ō* are elided, three times *ī*.

End of Dimeters.

Cretic word	38	Word like <i>mūlīcrem</i>	2
Iambic word	15	“ “ <i>cōmpēndīa</i>	1
Word like <i>dōlōrībus</i>	2	Monosyllable	2

Raptus est is virtually a cretic; *huius et* (1613.5) is exceptional.

It seems more likely that composers aimed at coincidence in our dimeters than in our senarii. In 59 complete dimeters we find coincidence in the first foot 44 times, in the second, 51, in the third, 48.

IAMBIC DIMETERS CATALECTIC.

In 1522 (Borysthenes Alanus) vv. 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 15 are pure, *i.e.* of the form $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \wedge$. 1522.9 *Ausus fuit nocere* is either $> \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \wedge$, like 1554.4, *Hic sum sepulta multis*, or is a first Pherecratic acatalectic, $\cup \cup \cup \cup \cup \cup$, scanning *aúsu' fúit* (cf. 1559.3, *animu' sánctus*, in a trochaic septenarius). The intermingling of the two metres in 1522 shows signs of symmetry, but this is disturbed just enough to leave us in doubt about the metre of verse 9. 1554.5 differs only in the first foot, *l]acrimís meórum amáris*.

These free iambic dimeters catalectic are sometimes hardly to be distinguished from Ionics a minore with anaclassis; e.g.

1554.4 *Hic sum sepulta multis*

1]acrimís meórum amáris

and when they occur in such a confusion of metres as that in 1554, an absolute discrimination is impossible.

We may add 225:

Aeterna domus hec est,

Pausum laboris hic est,

Aliquid memoriae hoc est.

This has clear traces of accentual rhythm; *domus* is practically a trochee, and *memoriae* shortens (?) its ultima before hoc.

TROCHAIC DIMETERS CATALECTIC.

217.1 *Déa uirágö Délia*

226.1 *Iúlia Píeris óbstetríx*

2 *Híc iacét nullí graúis.*

Bücheler calls 226, 1.2 "acephalos dimetros" [*s.c.* iambicos, vide G. L. VI, p. 398 K.].

TROCHAIC SEPTENARIIL.

We should like more of these than we have. Our 34 inscriptions contain only 58 verses; the longest has but five verses, and all are late.

The odd arses are short in 9 inscriptions, and are free in 25. In the latter, Meyer's Law is observed 7 times and neglected 12; but of these 12 words 7 end in the second thesis and do not count as cases

of neglect (see Draheim, *Hermes*, XV, 1880, p. 240). There remain 233.1 $\overset{5}{i}r\overset{6}{a}t\overset{6}{a}m$ (this we can avoid if we admit hiatus at the sixth foot instead of at the fourth); *CIL.* IV, 1425, $\overset{4}{l}i\overset{4}{n}g\overset{4}{i}t$; 211.8 $\overset{4}{u}i\overset{4}{x}i\overset{4}{t}$; 237.1 $\overset{4}{A}m\overset{4}{y}m\overset{4}{o}n\overset{4}{e}$; 235.3 (tolerably certain), $\overset{6}{f}\overset{6}{e}l\overset{6}{i}c\overset{6}{i}$.

Resolutions.

	1ST.	2D.	3D.	4TH.	5TH.	6TH.	7TH.	
Tribrachs	4	2	5	1	8		3	23
Anapaests	3	1	3	5	3	7		22
Dactyls	4	2		3		4		13

We get nothing like $\overset{1}{\text{—}} \overset{1}{\cup} \overset{1}{\cup} \overset{2}{\text{—}}$, or $\overset{1}{\text{—}} \overset{1}{\cup} \overset{1}{\cup} \overset{2}{\text{—}}$, formed by single words, or like $\overset{1}{\text{—}} \overset{1}{\cup}$, $\overset{1}{\cup} \overset{2}{\text{—}}$, such as occur in comedy. In 1559.3, $\overset{1}{A}n\overset{1}{i}m\overset{1}{u}s$ $\overset{2}{s}\overset{2}{a}n\overset{2}{c}t\overset{2}{u}s$ should probably be read $\overset{1}{A}n\overset{1}{i}m\overset{1}{u}'$, for the other odd arses are short. 231.2 gives $\overset{4}{i}n$ $\overset{4}{m}\overset{4}{a}n\overset{4}{u}$ before the main caesura.

The sixth arsis is long in 45 vv., short in 2, and consists of two shorts in 4. Illegitimate (?) is 176.1 only, $\overset{7}{f}\overset{7}{i}l\overset{7}{i}a\overset{7}{e}$ $\overset{7}{m}e\overset{7}{a}\overset{7}{e}$.

The main caesura falls after the fourth foot in 51 vv., after the fourth thesis in 6.

Quantity.

CIL. IV, 1425, $\overset{4}{l}i\overset{4}{n}g\overset{4}{i}t$; Ito-, -it lengthened by pause.

244.1 $\overset{1}{Q}u\overset{2}{o}\overset{2}{d}$ $\overset{1}{e}d\overset{1}{i}$. Compare the similar acephalous senarius, 187.2, and Bücheler's note on 244.1.

1526. D. 4 $\overset{5}{l}\overset{5}{e}g\overset{5}{i}o$ 229.3 $\overset{3}{s}a\overset{3}{c}r\overset{3}{a}b\overset{3}{o}$

241.1 $\overset{5}{s}c\overset{5}{i}t\overset{5}{o}$

1559.1 $\overset{4}{L}a\overset{4}{b}\overset{4}{e}r\overset{4}{i}$ measured as a bacchius, but in 1559.13 (hexameter) the same genitive is measured as an anapaest.

Omitting final iambics, words naturally iambic remain such in 7 instances, become pyrrhics in 4 (*manu*, *manus*, acc. pl., *mihi*, bis), and suffer elision in 1.

*Hiatus.**a) Semi-hiatus:*

233.3 quí ēmit

241.1 tē⁴ hōminesse*b) Real hiatus:*

233.1 Abiat Vénere Bómpeiána * íratám qui hoc laésaerít

or Bómpeiána⁴ irátam⁵ quí⁶ * hoc laésaerít⁷

In 230.2 it looks as if *et* were introduced to avoid medial hiatus. Bücheler compares Plautus, *Bacch.* 49.

Elision at the main caesura occurs in 8 verses. Long *e* is elided twice, *i* and *o* once each.

Synizesis: de⁵inde, Itonú⁵sia, Oppi¹a, Fu¹it

End of Septenarius.

Iambic words	21
Cretic "	12
Word like Státīlius	7
" " dōmīsēda	4
" " ōpūlēntissūmi	2
" " Ātēllānīca	1
Monosyllable (est)	<u>2</u>
	49

Of our septenarii, 42.85 per cent end in an iambic word, and 24.48 per cent in a cretic. The corresponding figures for senarii are 47.65 and 35.86.

Coincidence, in 54 complete septenarii.

1ST.	2D.	3D.	4TH.	5TH.	6TH.	7TH.
45	32	35	50	46	33	34

On the whole, the septenarii are disappointing, and do not teach us much.

One trochaic octonarius may be quoted here :

1799.2 Siquis título mánūs intúlerit nón illúnc recípiat téllus.

PHALAECEANS.

FIRST FOOT.	CLASS II 60 vv.	III 62 vv.	IV 34 vv.	TOTAL 156 vv.
Trochee	37	1		38
Spondee	19	47	3 ¹	97
Iambus		1 (1505.10)	1 (1528. B. 5)	2
— ∪	4	1		5
Dactyl ?		1 (1553.7)		1
	60	51	32	143
SECOND FOOT.				
Dactyl	59	53	32	144
Spondee		1 (1553.3)	1 (1555. A. 1)	2
— > ∪	1 (1504.38)			1
	60	54	33	147
THIRD FOOT.				
Trochee	60	56	33	149
Spondee		1 (1553.8)		1
	60	57	33	150
FOURTH FOOT.				
Trochee	58	55	31	144
Spondee	1 (1504.38)		1 (1555. A. 3)	2
Pyrrhic		1 (1516.10)	1 (1517.5)	2
	59	56	33	148
FIFTH FOOT.				
Spondee or trochee	59	54	33	146

Class II includes 1508 (11 vv.) and 1504 (49 vv.); 1504 is noteworthy as having 37 trochees in the first foot; 1553.1 is our only other instance, and in literary verse a first foot trochee is rather rare. 1504 has third foot caesura oftenest; classes III and IV incline rather to second foot diaeresis. The two initial iambs are 1505.10, *Nigrā*, and 1528. B. 5, *Iouis nūn* —

The irregularities indicated ² in the table above are :

First foot,

- 1553.7 Quā mi[hi] nō[n l]icu[īt] fruāre ūta
 “mi necessario requiritur, etiamsi mihi incisum erat.”
 Haupt in *CIL.* II, 59.

Second foot,

- 1504.38 Ergo salue Priāpe salue sante
 cf. vv. 1, 12, 18, 22, 32, 52.
 1553.3 Me aētātis uicēsīm[ó] dolébis
 cf. Catullus 55 and 58 b.
 1555. A. 1. Haé sunt páruae tuāe meaeq. sédes

Third foot,

- 1553.8 sí t]e flére iuát quitn[i] ŋge[m]scis

Fourth foot,

- 1504.38 Érgo salue Priāpe salue sante
 cf. above, under second foot; *sante salue* helps fourth foot.
 1516.10 Haéc inté tamen ét phi/sophándo
 1555. A. 3 Haéc est quém mihi súscitáui úuus
 “úuus éxcitáui corr. Schraderus.” F. B.
 1517.5 Múltorúmque amor éxcidít et ómen
 Bücheler conjectures *excidít set omne*.

Main Caesura.

	II.	III.	IV.
After 3d thesis	35	27	13
“ 2d foot	16	23	18
“ 2d thesis and 3d foot	4	1	
“ 2d thesis		1	1
“ 3d foot		4	
Elsewhere	5	1	1
	60	57	33

The first caesura after the dactyl is usually the main caesura; there are but nine exceptions to this in 150 verses. The two shorts of the dactyl

Form a pyrrhic word in	35 vv.
“ end of dactylic word	22
“ “ “ a polysyllable	2
Begin an anapaestic word	34
“ a longer word	9
Are divided between a trochaic and an iambic	22
“ “ “ a polysyllable and an iambic	2
“ enclosed in a choriambic (14) or longer (1) word	15
“ otherwise placed	9

Quantity:

1508.8 órö

1504.46 Cupí[dö

1517.1 Cupídö

Iambic words:

<i>mih̃, tib̃</i>	7	<i>homö</i>	1	<i>putā</i>	1
“ “ with elision	2	<i>modö</i>	1	<i>tuae</i>	1
<i>tib̃</i>	1	<i>eg(o)</i>	1		

A short syllable before a mute and liquid

Remains short in 5 instances

Is doubtful 3

Is long 2 (1516.1 *pát-ri* and 1518.4 *lác-rimulis*)

Harsh elisions: ē 2, ī 6, ō 2, ae 2.

Hiatus is found once:

1514.6 Ínclusó * uteró decém K(aléndas)

Synizesis is almost unknown:

1553.7 mi[hi]?, 1555.1 tuaé

Dialysis occurs twice:

1504.24 Íre pér silűás dat ille uó[b]is

1504.49 Zónulam út solűás diú ligátam

cf. Catullus 2.13, 61.53, 66.38.

Clausulae are not so important here as in iambic and trochaic verse. In Phalaeceans, coincidence must occur in the fifth foot unless the verse ends in an iambus followed by a monosyllable, and we have no monosyllabic ending; for 1505.4 ends with *nōli*, though the MSS. of Priap. 14 give *nōn est*.⁵

CLASS.	II.	III.	IV.	
Dissyllabic word ends	32	20	15	67
Trisyllabic " "	26	26	15	67
Word like Flāuīōrum	2	5	3	10
" " Apōllināris		3		3
	60	54	33	147

Coincidence.

CLASS.	COMPLETE VV.	IN 1ST.	IN 2D.	IN 3D.	IN 4TH.	IN 5TH.
II	59	56	38	25	36	59
III	51	43	24	25	25	51
IV	32	26	18	16	14	32

Or, in another form, verses with coincidence in

CLASS.		ONE.	TWO.	THREE.	FOUR.	ALL FIVE FEET.
II	59		7	16	28	8
III	51	2	10	15	19	5
IV	32	1	6	12	8	5
		3	23	43	55	18

I have omitted 1514.11, unmetrical, which in the *CIL*. Bücheler emends so as to make it a Phalaecean; in his *CLE*. he makes it a Sapphic.

and what looks like a sacrificial formula disturbs

1519.14 Mactúm corónatúmque

— ∟ ∪ ∟ > ∟ ∪

In 1519.3 we have Leibér Patér bimátus, on which *CIL*. VIII, 2632 notes “bimatus Henzenus dubitans interpretatur bimater [amphibrach; cf. Ovid *Met.* 4. 12; G. L. VI, 255.17 K.]; confundi enim uidetur Liber pater cum Dionyso, Iouis et Semeles filio.” *Bimatus*, two years old, agrees no better with the metre than it does with the sense.

I have passed by 1521.9

Diem defunctus obiit.

The Latin Corpus suggests

Djem défunctus obí(u)it.

obiuit is found in Verg. *Aen.* 6.801, *obiui* in Meyer's *Anthology*, 1231; and in *CLE.* 107.4 (also African) we have *Díarrytos*. I prefer to transpose

Defúntus diem obí(u)it

although in our other Ionics we have elision only once

1519.13 *Domínis munere honóre*, unless we decide to call 1554.5 *l]acrimís mebrum amáris*, an Ionic dimeter with anacalasis, rather than an iambic dimeter catalectic.

Quantity.

1521.8 Validá feb-re cremátus

1520.6 sácrandam

1520.9 ergö

1521.4 Trigíntă ét duóbus

1521.7 reads *Tertiúm muneris ánte*; should this be scanned with synizesis, *tertjũm*, or is the verse of the form > ∪ ∟ — ∪ ∪ ∟ ∪, according to Greek license?

The first foot is joined to the second by a dactylic word in 7 verses, e.g. 1521.2 *Medicá no|bilis árte*, and by a trochaic word in 2, e.g. 1521.5 *Sed cúm cun|cta paráisset*. Anacalasis prevents halving of the verse; of verses without anacalasis 4 only have (medial) diaeresis, e.g. 1521.3 *Annís qui|fere uíxit*.

PAROEMIACS.

These are found in two inscriptions, 1523 (11 vv.) and 1524 (6 vv.). Their structure:

	1ST.	2D.	3D.
1523, Anapaest	3	5	11
Spondee	8	6	
1524, Anapaest			5
Spondee	4	5	1

The one spondee in the third foot is in 1524.1 Neptúni uértex régmen. There are no dactyls. In 1523.1 *Apóllonia* is measured ∪ ∪ ∟ ∪ ∪. Bücheler notes inscriptional spellings *Apolonius* and *Apolaris*, and similar shortening in Greek metrical inscriptions (Kaibel 119, Attic, and 686, Roman).

MISCELLANEOUS.

First Glyconics Catalectic:

- 223.2 Mémbra quiéscunt áridá,
 3 Cufus orígo fúlgidá
 4 br]ébe refúlsit ínclitá.
 5 íll]e subíuit fúnerá.

Late, accentual rhythm.

Second Glyconics Catalectic:

- 219.5 Nám nobís puerís simúl
 219.22 Scíturús dominí fuít.

First Pherecratics Acatalectic:

1522 (Borysthenes Alanus) has 8 iambic dimeters catalectic, along with 8 first Pherecratics acatalectic (*i.e.* ∟ ∪ ∪ ∟ ∪ ∟ ∪), vv. 2, 4, 6, 8, (9?), 11, 12, 14, 16. They show little of importance: *Etruscos*,

bacchius (1522.4), *ag-ro*, spondee, 1522.6. Of the somewhat doubtful verse 9 we have already spoken.

Dochmiac:

134.3 *Amícis fidém bonám praestití*,
a dochmiac dimeter, unquestionably due entirely to accident; compare Plautus, *Persa*, 809, 811, 812, and *Bacchides*, 660, 661, 1137 (bacchiac dimeters catalectic).